



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,306	06/22/2001	Rogelio Robles	10990665-1	6814

7590 01/23/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/887,306	ROBLES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-9,11-24,26-29,31,34-37 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-9,11-24,26-29,31,34-37 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 11/9/2005.

**This action is made Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-24, 26-29, 31, 34-37, and 39 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 19, and 29 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 19-23, 26-29, 31, 34, 36-37, and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Der linden et al, hereinafter Vanderlinden (US Pub.# 2001/0013947 A1, 8/16/2001, filed 12/28/2000, Foreign EPO application filed on 1/4/2000), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings filed on 6/22/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderlinden.

Regarding independent claim 1, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a reproduction center using a submission form, which is displayed by a remote browser, has pull-down menus, and control buttons for selecting printers, and print options, and submitting the print job —*a first user interface with user accessible controls for selecting services for producing a production request captured on the remote computing device--* (0038-0046, fig.,3).

Moreover, Vanderlinden teaches the editing or changing of the submission form's pull-down menu to update functionalities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a reproduction center, whose capabilities are added to a pull-down menu for selecting the printer having the new functionality, as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing documents on transparent media. The updated information is placed, and displayed in the form's pull-down menu using a browser —*presenting to the remote computing device, a second user interface having user accessible controls for selecting one or more, if any, document production devices identified as being capable of providing services selected through the first user interface --* (0016, 0041, 0051, 0059, fig.3).

Furthermore, Vanderlinden discloses that after the user has selected several print options, a "job ticket" —*production plan--* is produced from the submission form containing the various options selected by the user—*merging the selected services and the captured production request into a production plan*. The "job ticket" is then uploaded to a server, and to the selected printer for completing the print request—*delivering the production plan to one or more selected*

Art Unit: 2178

*document production devices selected through the second user interface* (0035, 0042-0043, 0047-0049, 005-0052, 0056). Vanderlinden fails to explicitly disclose: *delivering the production plan in a device specific format*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have delivered the plan in a device specific format, because Vanderlinden teaches above routing job tickets to a printer capable of executing the job at the lowest possible costs. Thus printing documents at a minimum price at a printer which understands and is able to carry out the print request.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent media (0051).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches a submission form for selecting of printers, including those to be included in the updated submission form including capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0051).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing

Art Unit: 2178

transparent (0051). In other words, when the new printer is detected or queried by the client computer, then the update will take place on the submission form.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent. The updated printer information is obtained from a device capability store—*querying a services database* (0051, 0059).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update functionalities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu for selecting the printer, as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0016, 0051, 0059, fig.3).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the display of a list of all pending print jobs along with their current status, such as waiting, being printed, or is completed (0056-0059). In other words, the status is monitored to determine the progress of the print job, and then that status is displayed on the list.

Claims 9, 11-14 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing the steps found in claims 1-5 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Vanderlinden discloses the submission form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities as a result of updates made to the device capabilities store—*services database updated with services not currently represented in this database--* (0059-0060).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Vanderlinden discloses the submission form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities as a result of updates made to the device capabilities store—*services database updated with services not currently represented in this database—such as the addition of new printers—services not available on the network and services database and updating the database with the new printer* added to the reproduction center (0051, 0059-0060).

Claims 17-18 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing the steps found in claims 7-8 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

7. Claims 19-24, 26-29, 31, 34-37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al, hereinafter Suzuki (USPat. 6,477,589, 11/5/2002, filed on 3/15/1999), in view of Keeney et al, hereinafter Keeny (USPub # 2004/0148335 A1, 7/29/2004, continuation 10/16/2000).

Regarding independent claim 19, Suzuki discloses a software image which allows a user to print processing to be started by selecting a “print” option—*capture driver operable to capture the document production request—a first user interface with user accessible controls for selecting services for producing a production request captured on the remote computing device--*—for sending a print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67, col.19, lines 7-67, fig.1).

Moreover, Suzuki teaches displaying candidate devices, which meet a certain criteria, upon the selection of an option regarding the certain criteria on the software image —*second user interface having user accessible controls for selecting one or more, if any, document production devices identified as being capable of providing services selected through the first user interface --* (col.19, lines 27-67, col.21, lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Furthermore, Suzuki teaches a window for selecting candidate devices, such as printers, meeting certain setting conditions, and a software automatically displaying candidates meeting the specified condition-- *automatically identify the one or more, if any, production devices, capable of providing the service selection to generate and provide the second user interface to the production client, and to receive selections made through the second user interface* (col.19, lines 23-53, col.20, lines 57-col.22, line 67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach a *production server in electronic communication with the production client and operable to direct one or more selected document production devices to produce the captured production request with selected services, the production server comprising: a services engine ....a production engine operable to deliver the captured production request to a production device or devices selected through the second user interface*. However, Keeny discloses a server—*production server*—which is



Art Unit: 2178

connected with a client via a network, for routing the print job according to the requested print locations—*direct one or more selected document production devices to produce the captured document* (0022-0028, 0037). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki discloses a software image which allows a user to print processing to be started by selecting a “print” option for sending a print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67, col.19, lines 7-67, fig.1). Suzuki fails to explicitly disclose *to transform the production request into a selected format and to transfer the formatted production request to the production server*. However, Keeny discloses the conversion of a document to a pre-printing format, such as Postscript printer language to be submitted to the server (0022-0028, 0037, 0121). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki discloses a software image which allows a user to print processing to be started by selecting a “print” option for sending a print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67, col.19, lines 7-67, fig.1). Suzuki fails to explicitly disclose *the client interface is a web browser*. However, Keeny discloses the print job originating from a client having a web browser —*interface translator--* (0024). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network, such as the Internet.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki teaches a window for selecting candidate devices, such as printers, meeting certain setting conditions, and a software automatically finding, and displaying candidates meeting the specified condition—*identify services available on the network--* (col.19, lines 23-53, col.20, lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Suzuki teaches a unit list table—*database of known services--* storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach the production server. However, Keeny discloses a server—*production server*—which is connected with a client via a network, for routing the print job according to the requested print locations—*direct one or more selected document production devices to produce the captured document* (0022-0028, 0037). It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network-- *querying the document production devices* (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach *a production queue*. However, Keeny discloses a queue, located on the server, for storing one or more print jobs(0077). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 26, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach *a production manager in electronic communication with the production queue*. However, Keeny discloses the queue, located on the server, is maintained by a trusted party (0074, 0077). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach *a server locator*. However, Keeny discloses communications between the client and the server (0078). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding independent claim 29, Suzuki teaches displaying candidate devices, which meet a certain criteria, upon the selection of an option regarding the certain criteria on a client computer's software image —*production devices capable of providing the selected services, and obtain a selection of one or more of the identified production devices from the production client, and print options for performing printing—one or more services for producing a producing request, deliver the captured request to a selected production client--* (col.19, lines 27-67, col.21, lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Furthermore, Suzuki teaches a window for selecting candidate devices, such as printers, meeting certain setting conditions, and a software automatically displaying candidates meeting the specified condition-- *automatically identify one or more, if any, production devices capable of providing the selected services* (col.19, lines 23-53, col.20, lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Regarding claim 31, which depends on claim 30, Suzuki discloses a software image which allows a user to print processing to be started by selecting a “print” option for sending a print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67, col.19, lines 7-67, fig.1). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach deliver the production plan in a device specific *generic format* However, Keeny discloses the conversion of a document to a pre-printing format, such as Postscript printer language to be submitted to the server (0022-0028, 0037, 0121). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-

Art Unit: 2178

0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 29, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table—*querying the services database --*, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 34, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices—*querying document production devices --*, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 34, Suzuki discloses adding, and updating information about a device available on the network—*update the services available on the document production devices but not currently represented in the services database--* (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 36, Suzuki discloses adding, and updating —*identification new devices--* information about a device available on the network (col.20, lines 9-67).

Claim 39 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 27, and therefore is similarly rejected.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 11/9/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants note that Vanderlinden describes the addition of an option to a pulldown menu, and not a printer (page 9). The rejection has been clarified to indicate that whenever a new printer is added to the reproduction center, new options are added so as to indirectly select a printer to print documents, such as the printing of documents onto transparencies.

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants submit that Vanderlinden does not disclose or suggest the selection of services (page 16). As it has been indicated above, Vanderlinden discloses this feature as recited in the claim.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19, and 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding independent claim 19, Applicants submit that Vanderlinden does not show the amended limitation of automatically generating a second interface that identify production devices capable of providing specific services (page 11). As indicated above, this newly added limitation is taught by the combination of Suzuki, and Keeny.

Regarding independent claim 29, Applicants indicate that Vanderlinden does not show the amended limitation of automatically identifying production devices (pages 13, and 15). The Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this newly added limitation taught above by the Suzuki, and Keeny.

Claims 9, 24, and 35 remain rejected at least for the same reasons established above.

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Munson et al. (Pat. # 6,741,262 B1), Whitmarsh et al. (Pat. # 2002/0145627 A1), Tonkin (USPub 2005/0015392), and Sanchez et al. (Pat. # 5,832,298 A).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

  
**CESAR PAULA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

1/19/06